evidence of payment is to accompany the return. Power has been taken to determine the tax in cases where an incorrect or incomplete return or no return is submitted. In default of payment of the tax, it may be collected as an arrear of land revenue. An alternative method of collecting the tax from the wholesale dealer himself where he consents to the adoption of that course is also provided for. Dealers other than retail dealers have also to submit returns for facilitating the check of accounts of the retail dealers.

Power has been taken to inspect accounts and stocks of motor spirit. Provision is made for appeals against orders of the Deputy Commissioner or other executive officers of Government.

The Bill follows in the main the Madras Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939.

**Mr. C. V. RAMAN** was of opinion that there was no need to tax motor spirit sales in Mysore. It might be that such a tax was in force in the Madras Presidency for some time past, but that might be justified in view of the prohibition campaign introduced there.

**The PRESIDENT** informed the House that there was no idea of giving immediate effect to the proposed bill even if it became law, and that Government were only proposing the taxation with a view to avail themselves of it if and when it became necessary to do so.

**Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER** said that he would have no objection to the proposed taxation if Government would give him an assurance that motor spirit available in Mysore—which included a mixture of power alchohol supplied by the Mysore Sugar Distillery—would not give less mileage than pure motor spirit which was sold elsewhere.

**The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau)** replied that his own experience and that of some other motor car owners was that the mixture referred to was giving better mileage than pure petrol. It might be that the owner thought that the mixture gave less mileage. But the merits of the mixture could not be judged so soon. He would therefore request Mr. Y. V. Muniswami Iyer to wait for some more time.

As regards the bill under discussion, he said that, as already stated by the Dewan-President, the House might have the assurance that motor spirit was not going to be taxed immediately simply because the House had approved of the general principles of the Bill. Government would certainly study the rates and also the circumstances of the situation and avail themselves of the measure when it became necessary for them to do so. Government were fully aware that the price of petrol was high enough already and it was not their intention to increase it if they could help it.

*The general principles of the bill were then put to vote and passed unanimously.*

## REPRESENTATIONS.

**No. 1.—Abolition of the posts of the Deputy Director of Public Instruction and the Personal Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore.**

**Messrs. B. CHAMAIAH, and SIVANANJE GOWDA** (Seringapatam Taluk) and **M. SUBBIAH** (Seringapatam Municipality).

**Mr. M. SUBBIAH** moved the representation. In doing so, he reminded the Government of several representations having been made in the Assembly by different members to the effect that a re-distribution of districts should be effected with a view to reducing their number from 8 to 6. It was a matter for disappointment to some of the members who now found that the Government, instead of reducing the number of districts, had added one to the list by constituting Mandya into a new district. The only object underlying the representations in favour of a re-distribution of districts was retrenchment. It was with the same object that the present representation also was brought up, *viz*, that it was unnecessary to keep on the appointments of the Deputy Directors of Public Instruction and the Personal Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore. So far as Primary Education was concerned, the School Boards were already in charge

of it and all the work at present entrusted to the Deputy Director of Public Instruction could as well be attended to by the District Educational Officers. If this suggestion was adopted, the Deputy Directors' appointments could be abolished and the resulting savings put to some better purpose. Similarly, the work which was now being attended to by the Personal Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore could easily be attended to by the Treasury Assistant. If this was done and the appointment of Personal Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner abolished, substantial savings would accrue and there would be less need for Government to propose additional taxation such as that already discussed and approved by the Assembly in the course of the same day.

**Mr. B. CHAMAIAH** also spoke to the same effect. He said that the three grades of education, namely, Primary, Middle and High School, were being attended to respectively by Range Inspectors, District Educational Officers and Headmasters who were of the same grade as that of Educational Officers. They were all responsible officers and much supervision over their daily work was not necessary, so that there was not much need to have a Deputy Director to inspect the educational institutions in their charge in any great detail. As regards the Personal Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore, he said that there was no need for an appointment like that, more especially because the district charge had become very much lighter after the constitution of the Mandya District and also because the Deputy Commissioner of Mandya was able to carry on without a Personal Assistant.

**Mr. L. VEMA REDDY** spoke against the representation. He said that the Deputy Commissioner had very many kinds of work to attend to and was also expected to be out on tour frequently. Unless there was a Personal Assistant in his office, there would be no responsible officer who could give effect to the orders passed by the Deputy Commissioner on the very large number of records going up to him and also to get ready draft orders in accordance with the wishes and instructions of the Deputy Commissioner. Besides, signing of fair copies would itself take considerable time and if the Deputy Commissioner who might be out of station on many days in the month had himself to do this work also, disposal of cases would be delayed considerably.

**The FIRST MEMBER of COUNCIL (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau)** stated that the question under discussion had already been considered by Government in connection with the constitution of Mandya as a separate district, but that if at any time in future it was found that there was no need to continue the appointment of Personal Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore, that appointment would certainly be done away with. All that he could say at present was that the suggestion contained in this representation would be taken note of by Government.

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA** suggested that a similar statement be made concerning the appointment of the Deputy Director of Public Instruction.

**The DIRECTOR of PUBLIC INSTRUCTION in MYSORE (Mr. E. G. McAlpine)** spoke as follows:—

Proposals to abolish the two posts of the Deputy Directors are constantly being made in this House and elsewhere. I think that members who make proposals of this kind, do so in ignorance of the way in which the Education Department is being administered and of the part in the administration played by the Deputy Directors. The Deputy Directors have each four districts in their charge. The two Deputy Directors, between them, inspect not only High Schools but the offices of the District Educational Officers. They inspect also the District Normal Schools and all commercial institutions. They inspect hostels and a variety of other institutions which total about 120. It would be quite impossible to hand over these 120 institutions to the District Educational Officers who already have more work than they can do. Apart

from the impossibility of entrusting the work which the Deputy Directors do to other people, from the point of view of the work involved, there is the administrative aspect, which, I think, perhaps, the members do not realise. If you abolish the post of the Deputy Director, some one has to inspect these institutions, and in particular, some one has to inspect High Schools. Now, it is suggested, apparently, that this inspection should be entrusted to the District Educational Officers. But the District Educational Officers, in some cases, draw Rs. 200 per month, and the High School Headmasters, in some cases, draw Rs. 400. It is impossible to have a Junior Officer in the department inspecting a senior. There must of necessity be a class of officers, between the Director and the District Educational Officers, responsible for the very important work of inspecting High Schools and the offices of the District Educational Officers. It is quite impossible for the Director himself to undertake this work, if that is the idea in the minds of those who have moved this representation.

The Director of Public Instruction, a few years ago, had in his office a Deputy Director, a Personal Assistant, a Technical Assistant, a Lady Assistant and an Assistant for Urdu Education, —five officers—every one of whom was a gazetted officer and the senior of them was of the status of Deputy Director. One by one, these officers have been removed from my office until I have only two Personal Assistants left. Having no Deputy Director in my office means that the whole of the detailed work of my office devolves upon me, because the responsibility cannot be delegated to any one of a lower status than that of Deputy Director. It is therefore, in these circumstances, out of the question for me to inspect the High Schools and the offices of the District Educational Officers. Perhaps members of this House do not realise how long it takes to inspect a High School. When the Deputy Director goes to inspect a High School, he has to listen to the teaching of every teacher on the staff. Now, in a big High School consisting of 600 or 700 pupils, with perhaps 12 sections and 20 to 30 teachers, it takes nearly two weeks to inspect a school. I could not conceivably be out of my office for two whole weeks, doing nothing but inspect *one* High School. If I cannot do it—I have pointed out to you how the District Educational Officers cannot do it because most of them are junior in status to the High School Headmasters—then, I put it to the House that there is absolute necessity for the continuance of those officers who come between me and the District Educational Officers. They do work which no one else in the Department can do. If you abolish those posts, you must appoint some other class of officers and call them Circle Inspectors or by any other name you like,—provided they are senior to the District Educational Officers, and between them and myself. I think, perhaps, that members now realise these facts, and see that it is quite impossible to abolish these two posts.

**Mr. M. SUBBIAH** suggested that following a recommendation of the Retrenchment Committee presided over by Rajadharmapravina K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar, these appointments should be abolished. If this was done, he thought that high schools might be inspected by the Director himself, the other schools being inspected by the District Educational Officers.

**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENT (Mr. J. Appaji Gowda)** replied that it was not possible to accept the suggestion and that the work that the Deputy Directors were expected to do did not seem to have been clearly understood. It was absolutely impracticable for the Director of Public Instruction to take up the inspection work now done by these Deputy Directors. Each of the Deputy Directors was in charge of a Division, consisting of four districts and they had about 40 High Schools, besides other institutions, such as commercial schools, training institutions, hostels and other special institutions and the offices of the District Educational Officers to inspect during a year. They had also to supervise the work done by the

District Educational Officers within their jurisdiction. Unless there was proper inspection and supervision, there would not be adequate return for the amount spent and efficiency was bound to suffer The Director of Public Instruction could hardly tour for more than about 10 days in a month, as his presence during the major portion of a month would be necessary at headquarters to attend to the administration work and the meetings of the several committees of which he was either a Chairman or a member. Inspections of institutions could not be done during all the twelve months in a year, as no institution would be working during the vacation and other holidays. It would take about 10 days, if not more to inspect a high school in detail and considering the number of such high schools and other institutions, it would be evident how impracticable the suggestion was that the Director should take up the work of inspection of all institutions now done by the two Deputy Directors, in addition to his present work. Not only would his legitimate work suffer considerably if he should do so, but most of the institutions would be left uninspected for want of time—a position which would not appeal to or be approved by any one. It was therefore not possible to do away with the posts of Deputy Directors.

**Mr. Ballam SRINIVASA RAO** opposed the representation. He could not understand how the work could get on if retrenchment was effected at a time when everybody was urging for more schools which would mean more work to the officers of the Education Department.

**Mr. M. SUBBIAH,** however, said that able officers could easily manage the work even after the proposed retrenchments were effected.

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA** referred to the Director's contention that a junior District Educational Officer drawing, for instance, Rs. 200, could not possibly be deputed to inspect a high school managed by a headmaster drawing, sometimes, so much as Rs. 400. By way of reply to that, he quoted the example of auditors drawing only Rs. 40, Rs. 50 or Rs. 100 being entrusted with the work of auditing the offices of high officers drawing salaries exceeding even Rs. 1,000.

**The SECOND MEMBER (Mr. K. V. Anantaraman)** reminded Mr. Byanna that there was difference between audit and inspection.

**Mr. BYANNA** granted that it might be so. But even then he observed that it ought to be possible to effect retrenchments for the reason that without examining the question in all its aspects, two committees, *viz.*, Sir K. P. Puttanna Chetty's and Rajadharmapravina K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar's Committees, would not have recommended it.

**Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER** who opposed the representation stated that 40 years ago the expenditure on education was only Rs. 5 lakhs, whereas it was Rs. 50 lakhs at present. In a department administering such a large grant, if there was no Deputy Director, the money might not be properly spent and the tax-payer might not derive the fullest return for all the expenditure incurred by the State. If the number of officers was retrenched, he was afraid that the progress of education would be very much hampered.

**Mr. S. RAMAPPA** thought that the difficulty pointed out by the Director would not arise it only the seniormost of the eligible officers were posted as District Educational Officers.

**Mr. L. VEMA REDDY** was of the opinion that the District Educational Officers were already having very heavy work and many of the middle schools were going without inspection. He was therefore anxious that District Educational Officers should have nothing to do with inspection of high schools.

**NAWAB SHER KHAN** shared the views of the previous speaker.

**No. 2.—Recruitment to the gazetted ranks of men belonging to Naik (Beda) community.**

**Mr. B. CHINNOBIAH (Minorities).**

**Mr. B. CHINNOBIAH** represented that more men belonging to the Naik (Beda) community be recruited as Probationary Amildars and Assistant Commissioners and that such of those as were now in service be promoted to the gazetted rank.

**The PRESIDENT** replied that this was being done as far as possible.

No. 3.—Appointing Jyotinagara (Ganiga) candidates as probationers.

**Mr. A. DASAPPA** (Minorities).

**Mr. A. DASAPPA** represented that young men belonging to the Jyotinagara (Ganiga) community, which was a backward but loyal community, be appointed, according to their qualifications, as probationers, in the Revenue, Railway, Police and other departments.

**The PRESIDENT** replied that opportunities were being given to all deserving men as far as possible.

No. 4.—Empowering Amildars to grant lands up to 5 acres on darkhast applications.

**Messrs. B. L. BYANNA** (Bangalore City Municipality) and **B. M. MUNISWAMAPPA** (Special Interests).

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA** represented that according to the present rules, Deputy Commissioners were empowered to grant lands on darkhasts. But before exercising that power, every Deputy Commissioner was consulting the concerned Amildar in each case, for the reason that the latter, being the head of the taluk, would be acquainted with the conditions of the raiyats. Without the Amildar's recommendation, no application would be disposed of. Thus a lot of delay was being caused in the disposal of darkhast applications. For this reason, the member requested that Amildars themselves be invested with power to dispose of darkhast applications up to an extent of five acres. He sincerely believed that such a procedure would make for the convenience of both the Government and the raiyats.

**Mr. C. V. RAMAN** supported the representation and said that a resolution to the same effect had been passed at the previous Taluk Conference held at Chamarajanagar.

**Mr. M. SUBBIAH**, however, was of opinion that it would not be right that such a large power should be delegated to the Amildars. Grant of lands was an important matter which should be left to higher officers of and above the status of Sub-Division Officers.

**The FIRST MEMBER** (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau) replied that if the land applied for was assessed waste, the Amildar concerned was competent to dispose of the application. But if a darkhast referred to was a gomal land, it would not be desirable to empower the Amildar to dispose of the application, because questions like the extent of gomal land available for grazing purposes, the extent which could be thrown open to cultivation and such other connected details would have to be examined first. In such cases, the orders of higher officers were considered necessary.

**Mr. B. L. BYANNA** stated that even the particulars relating to those very questions would have to be furnished only by the Amildars concerned.

**Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU** did not, however, believe that disposal of darkhasts would be unduly delayed simply because the higher officers were expected to pass orders.

**Messrs. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER** and **MIR MAHOMED HUSSAIN** thought that the existing rules were all right and needed no modification.

**Mr. S. C. MALLIAH** represented that many parties had applied for lands and even paid deposits to the extent of Rs. 200 in certain cases, several years ago, but that orders had not yet been passed.

**The PRESIDENT** suggested that specific cases of that kind, if any, might be brought to the notice of Government so that necessary action might be taken.

*The House adjourned at 5 p.m., to meet again at 12 noon the following day.*